



2626  
✓ \$

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Pau Soler et al.

Serial No.: 09/919,260

Filed: July 30, 2001

Title: "COMPENSATING FOR DRIFT AND  
SENSOR PROXIMITY IN A SCANNING  
SENSOR, IN COLOR CALIBRATING  
INCREMENTAL PRINTERS"

Our docket: 60004608Z141

Group

Art

Unit:

2626

Examiner

Tia A. Carter

AMENDMENT

Hon. Commissioner for Patents  
Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to the Com-  
missioner of Patents, Washington DC 20231 on

May 9, 2005.

Peter L. Lippman, Reg.-22,835

Sir:

This is responsive to the  
Official Action dated February 8.  
Please amend this application as follows.

83 (for reading and interpreting test patterns) .

The latter means 83 include subportion 84 (for compensating for drift) — which in turn includes subsubportion 85 that reads and adjusts for reference tones.

Also included are portion 86, influenced by the "reading and adjusting means", that holds correspondingly modified transfer-function data, and also portion 76 that applies these data to adjust or correct the input contrast and color information 191. Also included is a final output stage 78 for controlling the print engine 216-241 etc. All these several distinctly different portions of the either-unitary-or-distributive integrated "circuit(s)" are separately referenced and discussed in the text of the specification.

For these reasons it is respectfully submitted that the rejections asserted in the Official Action are inapposite to the subject claims. Applicants therefore ask that these rejections be withdrawn.

#### Section 103 rejections

Also in the Official Action it is said that claims 1 through 19 are obvious over Bhattacharjya '213 in view of Tanaka '876. In the Action it is expressly conceded that Bhattacharjya fails to teach interpreting the sensor response to reference areas, but it is asserted — with reference to Fig. 3 and columns 11 (line 56) through 12 (line 6) — that Bhattacharjya shows scanning ("exposing the sensor to") the reference areas.

With respect, this assertion is without basis. Bhattacharjya in the cited passage says nothing about scanning

With respect, this assertion is factually in error. Please note that the system block diagram (Fig. 9) has a large main block labeled "integrated circuit(s)" — in which the letter "s" appearing between parentheses means that the block can be either one integrated circuit (singular) or two or more circuits (plural).

Furthermore the text of the specification at page 42 expressly confirms this understanding by stating (emphasis added) :

"The integrated circuits 71 may be distributive — being partly in the printer, partly in an associated computer, and partly in a separately packaged raster image processor. Alternatively the circuits may be primarily or wholly in just one or two of such devices.

"These circuits also may comprise a general-purpose processor (e. g. the central processor of a general-purpose computer) operating software such as may be held for instance in a computer hard drive, or operating firmware (e. g. held in a ROM 77 and for distribution 66 to other components), or both; and may comprise application-specific integrated circuitry. Combinations of these may be used instead."

The situation described in this passage is entirely consistent with modern practice in the incremental-printing industry, which employs these different packaging arrangements freely and interchangeably. Indeed, conceptually speaking there is little difference nowadays between these various arrangements, which are all simply a matter of economics and convenience in this field.

Finally please note that the diagram itself makes clear that there are several distinctly different portions e. g.:

80 (for printing test patterns),

82 (for converting analog to digital signals), and

5) CORRECTED FILING RECEIPTS

Attached for this application, and also for the companion case mentioned above, are respective separate Requests for Corrected Filing Receipt, reflecting these corrections. The Applicants sincerely regret the need for these corrections at this late time.

REMARKS

Applicants Soler, Vinyas, Rodriguez and Subirada wish to thank Examiner Tia A. Carter for having set forth her rejections clearly.

Section 112 rejections

In the Official Action it is said that claims 20 through 40 fail to comply with the written-description requirement because the phrase "portions of a processor" is unclear. For the reasons explained below, the Applicants respectfully traverse. In the Action it is said that (emphasis added):

"it is understood that the processor is a digital electronic device . . . wherein all of the teachings refer to the processor as one single device controlling various functions of the printing device."